



be directed to update the docket sheet accordingly.

Regarding Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, the court's records show that Defendant now states its Motion to Dismiss is moot because Plaintiff has completed proper service of process. (Filing No. [11](#) at CM/ECF p. 2.) Defendant requests that the court deny its Motion to Dismiss and permit it, along with the newly-added Bowers, to respond to the Amended Complaint by filing an answer or other responsive pleading. For good cause shown, the court will deny the Motion to Dismiss.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (filing no. [8](#)) is granted in part. Plaintiff is permitted to add William L. Bowers, Director of Industry Operation, Kansas City Division of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives as a Defendant in this matter. The remainder of Plaintiff's Motion to Amend is denied.

2. The Clerk of the court is directed to file the Proposed Amended Complaint (filing no. [8](#), attach. 1) as a separate pleading. The Clerk of the court is also directed to update the docket sheet in this matter to add "William L. Bowers, Director of Industry Operation, Kansas City Division of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives" as a Defendant in this matter. The Clerk of the court shall not add any other Defendant.

3. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (filing no. [6](#)) is denied as moot.

4. Defendants shall file their answers or other responsive pleadings no later than September 11, 2012.

DATED this 28th day of August, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ John M. Gerrard*

United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.